

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 19-38 have been resubmitted. Claims 19 - 27 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorrels (US 3,045,252) in view of Buraky (US 1,354,340). Claims 28 – 36 and 38 were allowed.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the 103 rejections of claims 19 – 27 and 37 for the following reasons:

There is no objective reason to combine the teachings of the Sorrels invention and the Buraky invention. The proposed modifications to the Sorrels invention would render it unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. The proposed modifications would change the principle of operation of the Sorrels invention. For these reasons, as well as the further remarks below, the applicant requests that the rejections outlined in the office action be withdrawn.

When considering the whole of the applicant's invention, including inherent properties, the applicant's invention is clearly directed to a movable system used for cleaning various surfaces and utilizing an applicator to apply clean fluid to the surfaces. Since the applicant's invention is useful for moving contaminated fluids that have been exposed to the various surfaces and then discarding the contaminated fluids in a deliberate fashion, the applicant's invention includes certain characteristics, both explicitly claimed and inherent, that enable the invention to perform its intended function. The movable characteristic of the application's invention is evident in the inclusion of wheels and casters in some embodiments and carrying handles in other embodiments. Additionally, the applicant's invention is configured to enable contaminated fluid from the applicator to be deposited directly into the waste receptacle. The

applicant's invention is further configured so that the applicator can discard fluid directly to the waste receptacle with the bath in the fill mode (due to the size of the waste receptacle opening) and to enable the bath to be switched from the fill mode to the empty mode using the applicator (rather than requiring hand contact.) As such, the applicant's invention provides means for discarding contaminated fluid *directly* to the waste receptacle *from* the applicator, and therefore precludes contamination of the bath, the user, and other elements of the invention due to contact with the contaminated fluid.

The Buraky invention is selected from the nonanalogous art of stationary toilet cabinets and such apparatus that are designed for hand washing. The elements of the Buraky invention provide a solution to a fundamentally different problem than the problem addressed by the applicant's invention. The tilting basin of the Buraky invention discards dirty washwater into a secondary basin, then into tertiary piping, and finally into a waste container. In the Buraky invention, both the secondary basin and the tertiary piping can be contaminated and, because of the configuration of the Buraky invention, remain contaminated due to their inaccessibility for the purpose of cleaning. This is clearly at odds with the configuration of the applicant's invention that provides access to all surfaces that can come into contact with contaminated fluids. Furthermore, the pivoting basin is inherently unstable, particularly when filled with fluid, and can tilt unexpectedly if the toilet cabinet were in motion. This may be acceptable for a stationary unit such as that disclosed by Buraky, but is not suitable for movable apparatus such as Sorrels and the applicant's invention. Even the stationary Buraky apparatus requires special structure to minimize spillage from the basin, as is evident by the inclusion of the "dish shaped piece of sheet metal 19" around the periphery of the basin.

The Sorrels invention is directed to a movable combination mop cart and mop sink. The Sorrels invention discloses a sink having a conventional drain, where the drain is operated by a remote handle positioned distal the sink. As such, Sorrels provides means for discharging contaminated fluid from the sink to the lower tank without requiring user contact with the contaminated sink surfaces. Furthermore, the Sorrels structural configuration of a flanged sink having a square cross-section is suitable for emptying the sink via the disclosed drain operated by the remote handle while minimizing spillage of contaminated fluid and precluding user contact with the contaminated fluid. Adding the unstable, tilting basin of the Buraky invention to the Sorrels invention would defeat these inherent characteristics of the Sorrels invention that make Sorrels useful for its declared function. Overcoming the abovementioned drawbacks resulting from adding the Buraky tilting basin to Sorrels would require substantial structural modifications to the Sorrels invention.

Modifying Sorrels to include the pivoting basin of Buraky would require substantial structural modifications that would render some of the novel, claimed elements of Sorrels ineffective. For example, Sorrels discloses a “novel ... spray mechanism forming part of the invention” as one of the explicitly stated objectives of the invention. The spray mechanism is disclosed as comprising “an outlet pipe 28 ... extending through a suitable opening in the sink.” Sorrels’ structural configuration of the stationary sink having an opening for the outlet tube positioned below the top of the sink provides a suitable configuration for the inherent objective of using the movable cart and mop sink while minimizing spillage. Modifying Sorrels to include the Buraky tilting basin would require penetrating the tilting basin with the outlet pipe, and consequently disabling the tilting ability of the basin. In addition, adding the Buraky tilting basin would require the user to hold the basin in a tilted position while simultaneously extracting contaminated fluid from the mop (applicator) into the lower tank.

Even if this complicated procedure were achievable, it is difficult to see where the mop would be positioned in order to discard the contaminated fluid directly into the lower tank.

Summarizing the previous points:

The Buraky invention is directed to nonanalogous art and the elements meant to be imported into the Sorrels invention do not solve the problem solved by the applicant's invention. Adding the Buraky elements to the Sorrels invention would render the Sorrels invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Adding the Buraky elements would require substantial structural modification to the Sorrels invention, and adding the Buraky elements would disable some of the claimed, inventive elements of the Sorrels invention.

Appl. No. 10/559,510  
Response dated April 15, 2009  
Reply to Office action of 01/16/2009

## **CONCLUSION**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action with respect to Claims 19 – 27 and 37 is requested. The applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In the event the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David J Bremer/  
David J Bremer, Reg. No. 51,497

Sabre Technical Services Corp.  
4917 N Damen Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60625  
773-271-6600